



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,514	04/15/2004	Rasmus Villefrance	891-011771-US (PAR)	8155
2512	7590	11/16/2007		
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			EXAMINER WON, MICHAEL YOUNG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,514

Applicant(s)

VILLEFRANCE ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Y. Won

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/2/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed April 15, 2004.
2. Claims 1-26 have been examined and are pending with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hlasny (US 7,222,160).

As per **claim 1**, Hlasny teaches a client device for obtaining a data object from a server device, comprising:

a transmitter (see col.3, lines 3-12: "Bluetooth radio transceiver") for sending to the server device a request (see col.4, lines 41- 49: "A search request message is created from the search parameters... and is transmitted 84 to the slaves") comprising a first codeword and an arbitrary alphanumeric string, wherein the first codeword indicates

that the alphanumeric string should be interpreted at the server as a search string (see Fig.4A; Fig.4B; and col.4, lines 35-41 & 53-61); and

a receiver (see col.3, lines 3-12: "Bluetooth radio transceiver") for receiving from the server device, in reply to the request, a data object comprising the arbitrary alphanumeric string (see col.4, lines 50-53: "the response list 136 includes the one or more identifiers for the objects having a relationship to the search parameters and their locations").

As per **claim 12**, which depends on claim 1, Hlasny further teaches wherein the alphanumeric string is followed by an extension that specifies the type of data object received from the server (see col.4, lines 37-38).

As per **claim 15**, which depends on claim 1, Hlasny further teaches comprised in an accessory to the server device (see Fig.1).

As per **claim 16**, which depends on claim 1, Hlasny further teaches comprised in an accessory to a mobile cellular telephone (see Fig.1).

As per **claim 17**, Hlasny teaches a method of obtaining a data object from a server device, comprising:

composing a request (see col.4, lines 41- 49: "A search request message is created from the search parameters... and is transmitted 84 to the slaves") comprising a predetermined first codeword and an arbitrary alphanumeric string, wherein the first codeword indicates that the alphanumeric string should be interpreted at the server as a search string (see Fig.4A; Fig.4B; and col.4, lines 35-41 & 53-61);

sending the composed request to the server device (see col.4, lines 41- 49: "... and is transmitted 84 to the slaves"); and

receiving from the server device, in reply to the request, a data object comprising the arbitrary alphanumeric string (see col.4, lines 50-53: "the response list 136 includes the one or more identifiers for the objects having a relationship to the search parameters and their locations").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hlasny (US 7,222,160).

As per **claim 9**, which depends on claim 1, Hlasny does not explicitly teach wherein the first codeword is 'search'.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The obtaining of the data object will be performed regardless of the codeword. Thus this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ any codeword in any order because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed, because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention, and because Hlasny teaches search parameters may comprise any "parameters that will permit the method to locate a data object that is stored on a remote device" (see col.4, lines 37-41).

As per **claim 13**, which depends on claim 1, Hlasny does not explicitly teach wherein the received data object is a vcard comprising the arbitrary alphanumeric string.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The reception of a data object will be performed regardless of the data. Thus this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive any data object because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed, because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

As per **claim 14**, which depends on claim 1, Hlasny does not explicitly teach wherein the received data object is a vcalendar comprising the arbitrary alphanumeric string.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The reception of a data object will be performed regardless of the data. Thus this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive any data object because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed, because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

5. Claims 2-8, 10, 11 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hlasny (US 7,222,160) in view of Scharber (US 6,542,964).

As per **claim 18**, Hlasny teaches a server device for providing a data object to a client device, comprising:

a receiver for receiving from the client device a request (see col.4, lines 41- 49: "... and is transmitted 84 to the slaves") comprising a first codeword and an arbitrary alphanumeric string (see Fig.4A; Fig.4B; and col.4, lines 35-41 & 53-61);

parsing means for parsing the request (see col.4, lines 37-41: "... or other parameters that will permit the method to locate a data object that is stored on a remote device");

detection means for detecting the presence of the first codeword in the request (see col.4, lines 37-41: "... or other parameters that will permit the method to locate a data object that is stored on a remote device");

search means for searching data objects to obtain a data object comprising the alphanumeric search string (see col.4, lines 37-41: "... or other parameters that will permit the method to locate a data object that is stored on a remote device"); and

a transmitter for transmitting to the client device, in reply to the request, the obtained data object (see col.4, line 50: "Response received from claves are displayed to the user 86").

Hlasny does not explicitly teach searching a database.

Scharber teaches searching a database (see col.10, lines 53-61).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hlasny in view of Scharber by implementing searching a database. One would be motivated to do so because databases are known repositories of resources.

As per **claim 19**, which depends on claim 18, Hlasny and Scharber teach further comprising a user interface for user specification of a search string and for displaying a data object, wherein the search means is arranged to search the database (see claim 18 rejection above) to obtain a data object, comprising the user specified search string, for display in the user interface (see col.4, lines 35-50).

As per **claims 2 and 20**, which respectively depend on claims 2 and 18, Hlasny and Scharber further teach wherein the request additionally comprises a second

codeword indicating the database (see claim 18 rejection above) to be searched and wherein the search means is arranged to search the database indicated by the second codeword (see Fig.5: "ADDRESS"; and col.4, lines 53-61: "UUID").

As per **claims 3 and 21**, which respectively depend on claims 1 and 18, Hlasny and Scharber further teach wherein the request additionally comprises a third codeword indicating the memory location of the database (see claim 18 rejection above) to be searched and wherein the search means is arranged to search at a memory location indicated by the third codeword (see col.5, lines 11-15).

As per **claims 4 and 22**, which respectively depend on claims 1 and 18, Hlasny further teaches wherein the request comprises the predetermined first codeword and the arbitrary alphanumeric string (see col.4, lines 37-61) and the parsing means is arranged to parse the header (inherency), wherein the first codeword indicates that the alphanumeric string should be interpreted at the server as a search string and not as a filename (see col.4, lines 35-44).

Hlasny does not explicitly teach a GET command comprising a header.

Scharber teaches a GET command comprising a header (see col.3, lines 52-56)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hlasny in view of Scharber by implementing a GET command comprising a header. One would be motivated to do so because Hlasny teaches of accessing objects via the Internet (see col.2, lines 58-62).

As per **claim 5**, which depends on claim 4, Hlasny further teaches wherein the arbitrary alphanumeric string follows but is separated from the first codeword (see col.4, lines 37-44).

As per **claim 6**, which depends on claim 4, Hlasny and Scharber further teach wherein the header additionally comprises a second codeword indicating the database to be searched (see Fig.5: "ADDRESS"; and col.4, lines 53-61: "UUID").

As per **claim 7**, which depends on claim 6, Hlasny further teaches wherein the first codeword follows but is separated from the second codeword and the arbitrary alphanumeric string follows but is separated from the first code word (see col.4, lines 37-44).

As per **claim 8**, which depends on claim 7, Hlasny and Scharber further teach wherein the header additionally comprises a third codeword indicating the memory location of the database to be searched by the server (see Fig.5: "ADDRESS"; and col.4, lines 53-61: "UUID").

As per **claim 10**, which respectively depends on claim 6, Hlasny and Scharber do not explicitly teach wherein the second codeword is one of 'pb', 'cal' and 'msg'.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The obtaining of the data object will be performed regardless of the codeword. Thus this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ any codeword in any order because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed, because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention, and because Hlasny teaches search parameters may comprise any "parameters that will permit the method to locate a data object that is stored on a remote device" (see col.4, lines 37-41).

As per **claim 11**, which respectively depends on claim 8, Hlasny and Scharber do not explicitly teach wherein the third codeword comprises one of 'SIM' or 'file'.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The obtaining of the data object will be performed regardless of the codeword. Thus this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ any codeword in any order because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed, because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention, and because Hlasny teaches search parameters may comprise any "parameters that will permit the method to locate a data object that is stored on a remote device" (see col.4, lines 37-41).

As per **claim 23**, which depends on claim 22, Hlasny and Scharber further teach wherein the header additionally comprises a second codeword indicating the database (see claim 18 rejection above) to be searched and wherein the search means is arranged to search the database indicated by the second codeword (see Fig.5: "ADDRESS"; and col.4, lines 53-61: "UUID").

As per **claim 24**, which depends on claim 23, Hlasny and Scharber further teach wherein the header additionally comprises a third codeword indicating the memory location of the database (see claim 18 rejection above) to be searched and wherein the search means is arranged to search at a memory location indicated by the third codeword (see col.5, lines 11-15).

As per **claim 25**, which depends on claim 18, Hlasny further teaches incorporated within a mobile cellular telephone (see Fig.1, #24).

As per **claim 26**, Hlasny teaches a method of providing a data object to a client device, comprising:

receiving from the client device a request (see col.4, lines 41- 49: "... and is transmitted 84 to the slaves") comprising a first codeword and an arbitrary alphanumeric string (see Fig.4A; Fig.4B; and col.4, lines 35-41 & 53-61);

if the first codeword is in a received request, searching data objects, using the alphanumeric string as a search string, to obtain a data object comprising the alphanumeric search string (see col.4, lines 37-41: "... or other parameters that will permit the method to locate a data object that is stored on a remote device"); and

transmitting from the server device, in reply to the request, the obtained data object (see col.4, line 50: "Response received from claves are displayed to the user 86").

Hlasny does not explicitly teach searching a database.

Scharber teaches searching a database (see col.10, lines 53-61).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hlasny in view of Scharber by implementing searching a database. One would be motivated to do so because databases are known repositories of resources.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons above, claims 1-26 have been rejected and remain pending.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Y. Won whose telephone number is 571-272-3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 7AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Won/

Primary Examiner

November 8, 2007